

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are now pending in this application. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected. Claims 1-20, 24 and 25 are held to contain allowable subject matter. Claim 21 is amended herein to clarify the invention.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

The Office Action states that the reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective since subsequent changes and/or new claims have been entered after the original oath/declaration was entered. Applicant submits herewith a supplemental oath/declaration, in which reference is made to the amendments filed January 28, 2002, April 7, 2003, November 17, 2003 and concurrently herewith. Applicant also incorporates the appropriate language under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) kindly suggested by the Examiner

Claims 1-25 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251. As noted above, an appropriate supplemental reissue declaration is filed concurrently herewith. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Willinger (UK Pat 2,021,371). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections.

For a rejection to be sustained under §102(b) each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the cited prior art reference. It is respectfully

submitted that the cited reference fails to disclose at least the following features and elements of the present invention as noted herein.

Independent claim 21 is amended and recites in pertinent part the following:

A method of anchoring an article within an enclosure bounded by a vertically extending peripheral boundary which defines an available bounded area within the enclosure, comprising the steps of:

disposing support structure within the enclosure, a portion of said support structure presenting a widened support expanse generally defining an attachment region within which said article is attachable thereto, said attachment region having an overall size and configuration requiring accommodation thereof within at least a minimum reception area substantially corresponding to the available bounded area within the enclosure;

As claimed, the method includes disposing support structure in an enclosure having an available bounded area defined by a vertically extending peripheral boundary, and in which, the support structure presents a widened support expanse generally defining an attachment region having an overall size and configuration requiring accommodation thereof within at least a minimum reception area, and

wherein such minimum reception area substantially corresponds to the available bounded area within the enclosure. Such claim recitation specifically relates an overall area size of an available attachment region defined by the widened support expanse of support structure to a corresponding area size of a bounded interior of an enclosure in which such structure is received, and requires that such widened support expanse be sized and configured such that the attachment region occupies most of the available bounded area within the enclosure. It is respectfully submitted that the UK patent application 2,021,371 (Willinger) fails to teach or suggest this claimed feature. Instead, Willinger teaches discrete support elements, each having its own attachment region extending within a perimeter thereof, a collective area of the attachment regions of a plurality of the support elements being accommodatable within a minimum area much smaller than the total available area of the enclosure within which they are depicted as being received. For example, as shown in Figures 6-8 of Willinger referred to by the Examiner, substantial spaces exist between the various support elements, which would allow the support elements to be received in a minimum reception area representing only a small fraction of the available area provided by the enclosure depicted in the figures.

Claim 21 particularly describes and distinctly claims at least one element not disclosed in the cited reference. Claim 22 depends from claim 21, and therefore also includes this element lacking in the Willinger reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 21 and 22 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a three (3) month extension of time to extend the response date to November 22, 2004. Please find Check No. 322 in the amount of \$490 to cover the above fee which accompanies a Petition For Extension filed

herewith. A request for Continued Examination is also being filed concurrently herewith. It is noted applicant is a small entity.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Lawrence I. Wechsler
Applicant

One Wooleys Lane
Great Neck, NY 11023
(516) 773-3565